

REMARKS

Upon consideration of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-36 and 38 have been previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 37, 39, 43-50, 54-59 were rejected as unpatentable over Neuhaus (U.S. Patent No. 5,832,466) in view of Kolawa et al. (U.S. 6,236,974). Claims 40-42 and 51-53 were rejected as obvious over Neuhaus and Kolawa and Metz.

I submit that the combination of Neuhaus and Kolawa does not render my claimed invention obvious. Specifically, my invention, as claimed in claim 37, is directed to detecting a spoken utterance from the user while the series of instructions are being provided to the user; and

responding to the spoken utterance by providing additional instructional data to the user using the output device to provide the additional instructional data in an audible form for the user to hear,

wherein **an interactive cooking session is established** such that a **subsequent one of the instructions is not provided to the user until the user provides a particular spoken utterance requesting the subsequent instruction.**

As I understand the cited references, Neuhaus and Kolawa do not render claim 37 unpatentable because Neuhaus and Kolawa do not teach or suggest the features of claim 37. Specifically, these patents do not teach or suggest responding to the spoken utterance by providing additional instructional data to the user using the output device. Also, the cited references do not teach or suggest **an interactive**

cooking session is established such that a **subsequent one of the instructions is not provided to the user until the user provides a particular spoken utterance requesting the subsequent instruction.**

Indeed, the Final Office Action relies on Kolawa to disclose the claimed interactive cooking feature. I respectfully disagree that Kolawa discloses the interactive cooking session as claimed in claim 37. Kolawa does not disclose the interactive cooking feature recited in claim 37.

Therefore, I submit that claim 37 is patentable.

Independent claim 49 recites similar features and is believed patentable for the same reasons.

The other claims in this application are dependent on one of the independent claims discussed above and are believed patentable for the same reasons. However, each dependent claim also recites an additional aspect of the invention and the individual consideration of each dependent claim on its merits is respectfully requested.

I believe all the pending claims are patentable and respectfully request
early passage to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

By Bruce S. Kerievsky

Bruce S. Kerievsky
Pro Se Applicant
(516) 466-2872